Considering the matters raised in the Office Action in the same order as raised, and turning first to the "claim objections", the renumbering of claim 8 is noted and the Examiner is thanked for his help in this regard. With respect to the objection to claim 16, this claim has been amended so that it depends from claim 12 as intended. Again, the help of the Examiner is appreciated.

In addition to the amendment referred to above, claim 11 has been amended as discussed below. Further, very minor amendments have been made to some of the other claims so as to eliminate the use of "bullets" at the beginning of paragraphs, to correct a misspelling and to cancel a reference to the drawings ("(38)" in claim 19).

Turning to the "claim rejections", claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being "unpatentable over Kostreski et al (US 00565979A) in view of Renaud et al (US005958051A)." Claims 12-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.103 as being unpatentable over the same references "as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Lett (US005771064A)." These rejections are respectfully traversed although, as indicated above, claim 11 has been amended to more clearly define over the references cited.

Considering first the amendment made to claim 11, this claim has been amended to provide that the authenticity of the electronic signature is verified and that if the signature is verified as being authentic and if the result of the claimed filtering is positive, the operating software is downloaded in a memory space in the platform. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification (see, e.g., page 8,lines 10-12; page 10, line 35 to page 11, line 2; page 11, lines 5-8; page 12, lines 19-21; and page 14, lines 31-36). This addition to claim 12, clarifies or sets forth in more detail the purpose of the signature and the filtering recited in the original claim.

Turning to the rejection itself, the Examiner basically contends that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital signature as taught by

Renaud in the application sent by the service providers of the Kostreski reference. It is respectfully submitted that this contention is not well taken.

Kostreski teaches a digital entertainment terminal (DET) 100 linked to different types of networks, such as a video dial tone network, including a distant server 252. It is first noted that the Kostreski patent does not suggest securing the communications between the server 252 and DET 100. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Kostreski and Renaud patents proposed by the Examiner is the improper product of hindsight.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that even if one skilled in the art were attempting to secure the applications in Kostreski, the obvious approach would be to secure the network itself. In contrast, the present invention provides security at the level of the platform, which enables downloading to be achieved where there is no network in the sense of the Kostreski patent.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as claimed in claim 11, particularly as amended, is not obvious from the actual teachings of the references relied on in rejecting the claim. Further, the claims dependent on amended claim 11 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 11.

Claims 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being "unpatentable over Kostreski et al (US005635979A) in view of Laubach et al (US006018533A)." This rejection is respectfully traversed and, in this regard it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 as originally presented patentably distinguishes over these references.

In brief, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process performed by the DET of Kostreski to be carried out in an AIM and to allow the DET to accept AIMs, based on the teaching in the Laubach patent relating to AIMs. It is respectfully submitted that this contention is not well taken.

First, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Kostreski patent that appropriate changes might be made in the DET to make the DET operable with an AIM of the type disclosed in the Laubach patent. Further, the Laubach patent discloses different kinds of AIMs, depending on the type of information sent upstream. It is noted that the

present invention does not provide that the general purpose processor module claimed is interchangeable in function of the type of information received. On the contrary, one object of the present invention is to make the platform operable with different types of service providers through provision of a single hardware type. It is respectfully submitted that there is no need for providing interchangeability as suggested by the Examiner so that the problem posed by the Examiner appears to be a artificial technical problem.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Kostreski and Laubach references is the improper product of hindsight and that, further, such a combination would not lead to the present invention as claimed in claim 18.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited and respectfully submitted.

End Remarks